

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COM United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 09/19/2003 Paul Lawheed 8354.C 2249 10/667,099 04/20/2004 **EXAMINER** 7590 Mr. Lynn G. Foster NGUYEN, HOANG M 602 East 300 South PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Salt Lake City, UT 84102

> 3748 DATE MAILED: 04/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Suggestion	10/667,099	LAWHEED, PAUL
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Hoang M Nguyen	3748
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		·
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_,	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>45-50</u> is/are pending in the application	1	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>45-50</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		•
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage		
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
Attachment(s)	Λ. C. J	(DTO 442)
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Ll Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate,
B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)		atent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)	

Application/Control Number: 10/667,099

Art Unit: 3748

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 45-54, 66-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. 3943719 (Terry et al) in view of U.S. 4760705 (Yogev et al).

Terry et al discloses all the claimed subject matter as set forth above in the rejection of claim 95, but does not disclose that the heating source for the coolant is a solar energy system. Yogev et al is relied upon to disclose that Yogev et al discloses a solar power plant comprising heat source 62 which can be a solar collector (lines 60-68, column 3) or a nuclear reactor, to generate power through the first loop through generator 66, indirect heat exchanger 67 is used to generate heat through the second loop including a Rankine cycle to generate electricity through low temperature turbine 72. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to direct coolant through a solar energy system in Terry et al instead of a nuclear reactor as taught by Yogev et al for the purpose of obtaining appropriate heat input.

Claims 45-50 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 17-23 of U.S. Patent No. 6672064. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because of the following reasons.

Application/Control Number: 10/667,099 Page 3

Art Unit: 3748

Claims 17-23 recite all the claimed subject matter in claims 45-50 of this application plus many more elements. It would have been obvious to eliminate the extra elements in US 6672064 to come up with this system for the purpose of simplifying the system.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3748

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Examiner Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-3477. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday--Thursday from 7:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Denion, can be reached on (703)-308-2623. The fax phone number for the Examiner is (703) 872-9302 for regular communication, and (703) 872-9303 for after final communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0861.

HOANG NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3748

Hoang Minh Nguyen 4/16/04